

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 15-26 are withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Waarts (U.S. 5,790,576).

Claims 12-13 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waarts.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waarts in view of Chiappetta *et al.* (U.S. 6,724,791).

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waarts in view of Andrews (U.S. 5,640,188), and in further view of Andrews (U.S. 5,432,535) and Kuniyasu *et al.* (U.S. 2002/0018499).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waarts in view of Andrews '188 and in further view of Kuniyasu.

Applicants assert that the claim amendments included herein overcome each of these rejections, as explained below.

**Statement of Substance of Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Van Roy for the interview held on November 24, 2009. Consistent with the Examiner's Interview Summary, claim language was discussed that would overcome the Waarts reference (U.S. 5,790,576). This language is hereby incorporated into independent claims 1, 12, and 13.

References listed in the IDS filed on March 12, 2009 were also discussed, but language was not formulated to the degree that agreement could be reached.

**Claim Amendments**

The phrase “greater than zero” has been added after “a predetermined distance” in claims 1, 12, and 13 to overcome the Waarts reference.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Waarts nor the remaining art of record disclose, “said collimator-lens array is fixed to said block so that an area of an end surface of said collimator-lens array is in contact with and overlaps an area of said lens-setting surface at only outer sides of said block with respect to a widthwise direction of said block.” Such language (or language akin thereto) has been added to independent claims 1, 12 and 13. Support for this amendment may be found at least in FIG. 8.

Applicants respectfully request that these amendments be entered. Thereupon, Applicants respectfully assert that each of the rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed to pass to issuance.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 7, 2009

  
M. Thomas Andersen  
Registration No. 59,956